

REMARKS

This is a Supplemental Amendment to the Amendment filed April 2, 2007.

The Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the Examiner Interview conducted on April 5, 2007.

In response to the Examiner Interview, claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended to further clarify the distinction between "a first user account and a first password" and "a second user account and a second password, based upon the Examiner's comments.

In addition, claims 7, 8, 10, 11 and 13-14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Therefore, claims 1, 3-6 and 14 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 112 rejection of claims 1, 5 and 6:

Regarding the Examiner's comments at page 3 of the Office Action, various embodiments of the present invention, disclose, for example, "a first user account and a first password" set in a computer 101 (see Fig. 6C, for example). Then, as shown in Fig. 10C, "a second user account and a second password" set in the computer 103. As described at page 22, lines 1-9, the second user account and the second password" are added to the electronic mail. Further, at page 22, line 25 to page 23, line 8, discusses, logging in the FTP server 162 by the use of the "second user account and the second password" added to the "electronic mail". The Applicants respectfully submit that what is set in the transfer management information 101e shown in Fig. 6C, is "the first user account and the first password" to be used to access the FTP server 161. Further, on the other hand, what are set in the transfer management information 103e of FIG. 10C are the "second user account and the second password" to be used to access the FTP server 162. Therefore, based upon the comments mentioned above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended to overcome the rejection. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"An electronic mail system for delivering electronic mail sent from a sender to the appropriate receiver, the system comprising:

attached file retrieving means for retrieving, in the case of a first store location information, a first user account, and a first password being added to electronic mail sent from the sender, an attached file from a server of location shown by the first store location information using the first user account and the first password;

attached file separating means for separating, in the case of the attached file being added to the electronic mail sent from the sender, the attached file from the electronic mail;

log-in account adding means for adding a second user account and a second password different from the first user account and the first password, to the electronic

mail;

attached file transferring means for transferring the attached file separated from the electronic mail by the attached file separating means or retrieved from the server by the attached file retrieving means to a predetermined server using the second user account and the second password, to enable a user to refer to the attached file transferred by logging in at the predetermined server such that the predetermined server is protected from being attacked from outside of a network associated with the predetermined server; and

store location information adding means for adding second store location information indicating a location where the attached file transferred by the attached file transferring means is stored to the electronic mail.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to recite features somewhat similar to those recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, withdrawal of the 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 5 and 6:

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (previously cited) in view of Tanaka (previously cited):

Neither of the foregoing references, individually or combined, discusses the features as recited in amended claim 1, for example, as mentioned above.

At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Arnold fails to discuss "adding a first user account and a first password" as recited in claim 1, for example. Nor does Arnold discuss "a second user account" and a second password" as also recited in claim 1, for example. However, the Examiner asserts that Tanaka makes up for the deficiencies of Arnold.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Tanaka fails to make up for the deficiencies of Arnold. In contrast, as previously mentioned, Tanaka merely discusses a communication system which enables communication with a desired party user even when a caller user of a communication terminal does not know a terminal address of a communication terminal of the party user, while eliminating the need for provision of a monitor server (see column 2, lines 34-46). As shown in FIG. 13, for example, a communication terminal 1000a of a user A first gets its own terminal address and prompts its own user to enter its own password and stores the terminal address and password in an outgoing file as an electronic mail directed to a user B of a communication terminal 1000b (see column 19, lines 35-47). The user B receives the electronic mail from a mail server and then the user B is prompted to perform a reply communication. The communication terminal 1000b prompts the user B to information the communication terminal 1000a of user A of the reply communication. The password stored in the outgoing file is attached to a command "connection request" to be transmitted at the time of the reply communication. The communication terminal 1000a of user A when receiving the command "connection request", collates the password attached to the received command "communication

request” with the password stored in the password storage file and when identical, the communication terminal 1000a of user A determines that its own user A asked the user B the reply communication, and then transmits a command “calling notification” to the communication terminal 1000b of user B which sent the command “connection request” (see column 19, line 49 – column 20, line 8). Then, an “incoming” message appears at the communication terminal 1000a of user A, while a “calling “ message appears at the communication terminal 1000b of user B. When the user A enters an instruction accepting the “incoming” message, a communication channel is established between the communication terminals 1000a and 1000b to enable communication between users A and B. That is, in Tanaka, a password is merely used to confirm that user A wants a reply communication from user B. The communication system of Tanaka does not enable an attached file to be separated from the electronic mail sent to user B and to be stored using a second password and a second user account, in order for user B to be able to retrieve the attached file separately upon request.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited references.

The combination of Arnold and Tanaka fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness over the present invention. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or discuss all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Thus, Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/12/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 

Derrre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501